

DEC 15 2008

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSE MENDOZA DELGADO,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 08-71633

Agency No. A075-623-493

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted December 1, 2008^{**}

Before: GOODWIN, CLIFTON and BEA, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA")
order denying petitioner's motion to remand.

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

We review the BIA's ruling on a motion to remand for abuse of discretion. *Malhi v. INS*, 336 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2003).

We have reviewed the opposition to the motion to dismiss in part this petition for review for lack of jurisdiction, and we conclude that petitioner has failed to raise a colorable constitutional or legal claim to invoke our jurisdiction over this petition for review. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926 (9th Cir. 2005); *Torres-Aguilar v. INS*, 246 F.3d 1267, 1271 (9th Cir. 2001).

Accordingly, respondent's motion to dismiss in part this petition for review for lack of jurisdiction is granted. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i); *Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 601 (9th Cir. 2006) (concluding that the court lacks jurisdiction to review the Board of Immigration Appeals' denial of motion to reopen for failure to establish a prima facie case if a prior adverse discretionary decision was made by the agency).

To the extent petitioner raises an ineffective assistance of counsel claim, the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioner's motion to remand on this ground because petitioner's ineffective assistance of counsel claim was previously addressed by the BIA's February 24, 2005 decision.

Accordingly, respondent's motion for summary disposition in part is granted because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not

to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard).

The temporary stay of removal and voluntary departure confirmed by Ninth Circuit General Order 6.4(c) and *Desta v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2004), shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

All other pending motions are denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.